

University of Northern Iowa  
**UNI ScholarWorks**

---

Documents - Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

---

3-10-1986

## University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 10, 1986

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©1986 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents)

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 10, 1986" (1986). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 514.  
[https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/514](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/514)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

Faculty Senate

March 10, 1986

1360

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Comments from Vice President and Provost Martin.

CALENDAR

2. 408 Request that the Senate approve the procedures to be followed when a department requests to change college or school affiliation--Senate Task Force. Docketed in regular order. Docket 347.
3. 409 Report from the Committee on Admission and Retention. Docketed in regular order. Docket 348.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

4. Consultative session with the Select Committee on Enrollment Procedures.

DOCKET

5. Rejected motion to move Docket Item 407 to the head of the docket.
6. 405 344 The creation of a Faculty Committee on International Studies. Approved.
7. 406 345 Change in certification requirements for teacher education. Approved.
8. 407 346 Revision of Home Economics Major due to accreditation requirements. Motion to approve was defeated.

The Senate was called to order at 3:30 p.m. on March 10, 1986, in the Board Room of Gilchrist Hall by Chairperson Boots.

Present: Boots, Chadney, Elmer, Erickson, Goulet, Hallberg, Heller, Intemann, Krogmann, McCormick, Peterson, Remington, Richter, Story.

Alternates: Schurrer for Baum, Leander Brown for Kelly, Wielenga for Scoles.

Absent: Duea, Glenn, Amend (ex officio).

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. Anne Phillips of the Waterloo Courier was in attendance.



## ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Vice President and Provost Martin rose to address the Senate. He stated that we are faring pretty well in competition for funding of summer institutes. There will be a mini-grant program available but funding will be less than in the past. It is hoped that we can set aside some grants for coursework development for general education.

## CALENDAR

2. 408 Request that the Senate approve the procedures to be followed when a department requests to change college or school affiliation--Senate Task Force (see Appendix A).

Chadney moved, Schurrer seconded, to docket in regular order. Motion passed. Docket 347.

3. 409 Report from the Committee on Admission and Retention.

McCormick moved, Intemann seconded, to docket in regular order. Motion passed. Docket 348.

## NEW/OLD BUSINESS

4. Members of the Committee on Enrollment Procedures were present to hold a consultative session with the Senate.

Professor Grace Ann Hovet, Chair of the Committee on Enrollment Procedures, rose to address the Senate. She pointed out that the university had submitted to the Board of Regents at its December meeting a request for a study of an enrollment limit. Subsequently, Vice President Martin appointed the members of the Committee on Enrollment Procedures and charged them to create a specific plan. Professor Hovet stated that the committee has been gathering information and hearing concerns relative to procedures to limit enrollment. She stated that the task is an immediate and short-term procedure for restricting enrollments and does not include the establishment of any arbitrary size limit. She stated the committee is weighing the concept of open access, fairness, and quality. The committee has identified groups of enrolled students which include freshman, nontraditional, minorities, transfers, and readmissions. She pointed out that the committee is eager to provide consideration for special populations and is focusing on the quality of students who are admitted or readmitted. The committee has previously had a meeting with high school personnel to hear their concerns in this area. The desire to hear the concerns from the faculty's viewpoint brings the committee to the Senate today.

The Senate moved into consultative session. The Senate rose from consultative session.

## DOCKET

5. The Senate had before it a letter from Dr. Virgil Noack requesting that Calendar Item 407 be placed at the head of the docket for discussion at the meeting today.

Story moved, Schurrer seconded, to move docket 346 to the head of the docket.



Assistant Vice President Geadelmann pointed out that this item, should it be approved, could not be immediately considered by the Board of Regents. The procedure calls for a review by the Interinstitutional Committee prior to the Board taking final action.

The motion was defeated.

6. 405 344 The creation of a faculty committee on International Studies (see Senate Minutes 1359).

Hallberg moved, Chadney seconded, approval of the organization of this committee.

Professor Richard Newell pointed out that this request is a product of several months of study and that the request tries to recognize the diversity and size of the different populations involved in international studies.

Senator Hallberg asked if the committee will meet frequently.

Professor Newell stated that if the committee is comprehensive in its powers it will then set direction and priorities. In the early stages the committee may meet quite often but subsequently divide into smaller specialties so that the larger body can serve as a policy-formulation group.

Vice Chairperson Krogmann asked if representation from Latin America was left out on purpose.

Professor Newell responded in the affirmative but pointed out that a representative from the area of Latin America could serve by election from the college.

Chairperson Boots pointed out that the Chair of the Faculty Senate, the Chair of the Faculty and a representative of the Office of Academic Affairs are charged with identifying appointees for presentation to the Senate.

Assistant Vice President Geadelmann stated that she was concerned with the clause "create and oversee programs" as this phrase may relate to the operations of the Curriculum Committee.

Professor Newell stated that this committee would be responsible to the Senate and to other bodies that are responsive to the Senate.

Senator Peterson inquired of Professor Newell if he would consider the addition of an ex officio member to this committee, a person from the acquisitions area of the Library.

Professor Newell agreed to this suggestion and by friendly amendment the addition of one ex officio member from the Acquisition Departments of the Library was added to the composition of the committee.

Question on the motion was called. Motion passed.

7. 406 345 Change in certification requirements for teacher education (see Senate Minutes 1359).

Story moved, Schurrer seconded, for approval.



Registrar Leahy pointed out that currently the 2.4 standard for departmental approval is being used. This proposal puts the floor at which a department can grant approval at 2.2. He stated that this will cause no big change with the majors but that previously no standard was applied to minors.

As a related area, he mentioned that the Teacher Education Coordinating Council had requested that the Registrar's Office place on students' academic records the areas for which they are being recommended to the Department of Public Instruction to be certified to teach. Registrar Leahy stated that his office has begun work in this area and hopes for implementation in the near future.

Senator Intemann inquired if once this policy relative to GPA is implemented will the Registrar's Office keep track of the students' major and minor grade point averages.

Registrar Leahy stated that his office is developing a degree audit which will calculate major and minor grade point averages and that he hopes to have the degree audit implemented next year.

Question on the motion was called. Motion passed.

8. 407 346 Revision of Home Economics Majors due to accreditation requirements (see Senate Minutes 1359).

Story moved, Schurrer seconded, for approval.

Professor Noack stated that the letter from the Curriculum Committee explains why this request is being brought forward at this time. The department wishes to pursue reaccreditation by the American Home Economics Association and is trying to apply their guidelines and the guidelines of the American Dietetics Association to their programs.

Senator Remington stated that he was struck by the vote of the Social and Behavioral Sciences College Executive Council that approved this recommendation on a vote of two yes with four abstentions. He characterized this as being a very weak approval coming from the college to the Faculty Senate.

Professor Pershing indicated that the department has made changes in the program as they have worked with the Curriculum Committee.

Vice Chairperson Krogmann asked why the department is seeking approval from two different accrediting bodies.

Professor Pershing indicated that the department would like all of their programs approved under the umbrella of the American Home Economics Association and in addition the dietetics program needs the accreditation of the American Dietetics Association.

Vice President Martin stated that while he is sympathetic to the department he sees a continuing encroachment upon institutional autonomy by undergraduate specialization and accreditation bodies. He encouraged the Department of Home Economics to resist and stated that he hopes the university will support them in this effort. He stated that to resist on principle is different from being denied accreditation or not seeking accreditation because we do not agree with their requirements. He stated that at some time we will have to stand our ground with the accrediting agencies.



Vice Chairperson Krogmann inquired as to what other departments of Home Economics are doing in this area.

Professor Pershing stated that all other departments are trying to meet these guidelines; however, their approaches may be different.

Senator Chadney inquired if the accreditation requirements specify specific courses.

Professor Pershing responded that the requirements are listed in terms of competency.

Chairperson Boots inquired if the department has considered making this major into a five-year program.

Professor Pershing responded that a student can complete these majors in four years.

Chairperson Boots pointed out that that would be impossible if the student is required to have 18 hours of electives outside of their major department.

Senator Story indicated that students on the dietetics program are required to have a year of internship after their degree before they are eligible to take the licensure exams.

Senator Richter pointed out that a student would need to take General Chemistry I and General Biology I as prerequisites to the student's major. The department is assuming that these courses will be taken by students as partial fulfillment of their general education requirements. Senator Richter pointed out that these courses may not be offered in our new general education program.

Professor Pershing stated that institutions that may have accreditation through the American Dietetics Association and not through the American Home Economics Association are usually the larger institutions. She stated that the Home Economics Department at UNI feels it is very important that all of the programs are accredited by the American Home Economics Association as well as acquiring the appropriate accreditation in some areas of specialization.

Senator Erickson pointed out that if this major was comprised of 70 hours and a student had to take 12 prerequisite hours which are not part of general education plus the 47-hour general education program and 15 hours outside of their major for university electives, the grand total for this student's degree would be 144 hours.

Senator Hallberg stated that he viewed many of the competency requirements as listed as being characterized by areas of global knowledge. He stated he found it difficult to put specific course titles with each of these competencies.

Senator Goulet inquired if the minimum qualifications for licensure required that the student must graduate from an accredited American Dietetics Association institution.



Senator Story responded in the affirmative and pointed out that students had alternate means of satisfying some of these requirements. For example, a student could complete a master's degree and a student may substitute four years of experience for the internship requirement. However, in all cases the student must possess a bachelor's degree from an institution accredited by the American Dietetics Association.

Senator Schurrer asked if the department felt that they could receive American Dietetics Association accreditation without having American Home Economics Association accreditation.

Senator Story stated that yes the department could have accreditation through the American Dietetics Association, but they are not sure what would happen to their other programs currently being accredited by the American Home Economics Association. Senator Story pointed out that there currently exists on this campus majors longer in length than the one currently under discussion. She pointed out that not all of the hours in these majors are within their department. She stated that it is necessary for them to have their program into the association by September 1. The department does not have the people on staff this summer to do additional work on this proposal and reminded the Senate that since this proposal needs the recommendation of the Interinstitutional Committee and the approval of the Board of Regents that it is probably necessary to move forward with this request yet this spring semester.

Senator Remington pointed out that the university is moving into a stronger general education program. He felt the university's first commitment should be along those philosophical lines.

Senator Hallberg inquired if the department has considered making this major into a combined BA-MA program.

Professor Noack indicated that the internship does carry with it some credit applicable to the MA program. However, the MA program requires more resources and facilities than we currently have.

Senator Chadney suggested to the department that they may wish to consider delaying this proposal for at least one month until we can see which courses will be offered on the new general education program.

Question on the motion was called. The motion was defeated.

Chadney moved, McCormick seconded, to adjourn. Motion passed.

The Senate adjourned at 5:26 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip Patton  
Secretary

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, Tuesday, April 1, 1986.



## APPENDIX A

3/5/86

-2-

### PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED WHEN A DEPARTMENT REQUESTS TO CHANGE COLLEGE OR SCHOOL AFFILIATION

#### I. Exploration: Parties directly involved

- A. The process begins with exploratory dialogue between the department and the school/college to which the move is to be made. It is understood that such a request may be initiated by an individual, a department, or a college/school.
- B. At this level it is appropriate for the discussions to be confidential and informal.

#### II. Study: College level discussions

- A. Once it is determined that a move is appropriate and possible, the college or school being vacated is to be informed in writing of the proposed move. Letters should be sent to the College Dean and to the College Faculty Senate/Council.
- B. It is expected that all parties directly affected by the move will meet to discuss the proposed move. Minutes of the meetings and a list of the people invited to the discussion, as well as the dates of the meetings held, should be documented and retained for the duration of the process.
- C. If there is a wish to proceed with the plan to move, the group (or person) responsible for initiating the proposal should send a copy of the proposal to all college/ school senates or councils and deans.

#### III. Study: University level

- A. If there is a wish to proceed once the discussions have been held, the individual or group initiating the proposal should send a formal request to the Senate. The request should be in the form outlined in 7.5 of the University Faculty Senate Bylaws.

7.5 Form of Senate Resolutions. Except for business introduced under the provisions of 7.44, the individual or group desiring Senate consideration of an issue shall put the issue in the form of a resolution signed by the petitioner and file the document with the chairperson of the Senate (with a copy to the secretary of the Senate). The secretary shall prepare copies of the resolution, together with all supporting documents, and furnish each Senator with a complete file prior to entering the resolution on the Senate calendar. The resolution should present such facts as are needed to establish the importance of the problem and to indicate its present status and should close with the standard phrase, "Therefore, be it resolved....." or some other form of specific proposal in which the petitioner shall clearly indicate the kind of action he/she deems advisable.

- B. The request will be placed on the Senate Calendar and docketed according to the will of the Senate.

- C. One full week (5 class days) before the discussion of the docketed item, the Senators must be provided with the following documentation if it has not been previously presented.
  1. Proof that the proposal to move has been made available as an agenda item in each college and/or school senate/council in the University.
  2. A statement, supported by discussion with other departments and/or colleges, as to the impact of the move on the mission of the University.
  3. An outline of the exact steps taken during the instigation of the move including the name of the proposer and the dates of all department and college/school formal discussions.
  4. Proof that all items of documentation have been sent to people on the other side of the issue in sufficient time for them to formulate a response.

#### IV. Senate Considerations

- A. The Senate will hold discussion based on documentation received 5 class days before the Senate meeting. No late documentation will be considered.
- B. The Senate may vote to approve based on documentation and extended discussion.
- C. The Senate may vote to disapprove based on documentation and extended discussion.
- D. The Senate may vote to return to petitioners for further documentation.
  1. The matter may be returned to the Senate for a second discussion in a minimum of 6 weeks (actual date to be set by chair or requested by petitioner). During that time, it will be expected that the parties involved will exchange drafts of their further documentation within a 2 week period. Responses may take another 2 weeks.
  2. The new documentation must again be sent to the Senators 5 class days before the Senate meeting when the matter will again be discussed. No late documents will be considered.
  3. Proof should be provided that all items of documentation have been expediently sent to the opposition in order that they may reply in written form.
- E. The Senate will then reconsider the proposal and vote.

Note: If this proposal is approved by the Senate, a member of the Task Force will make the following motion: The policy should be forwarded to President Curris for consideration for inclusion in the Policies and Procedures Manual.

Task Force: Charles Gillette  
Marvin Heller  
Myra Boots, Chair